

REMARKS

The examiner considers the claims to be drawn to six patentably distinct inventions or groups and requires restriction to one of Inventions I-VI.

Applicant elects without traverse Invention III, presenting comprising claims 5 and 6, drawn to a method for treating or inhibiting the development of inflammation due to trauma to the brain, which may result from surgery.

It is understood that claims 1-2, 8-14 and 21 link Inventions I-VI and that the restriction requirement among the linked inventions is subject to nonallowance of the linking claims 1-2, 8-14 and 21. Upon allowance of the linking claims, the restriction requirement as to the linked inventions shall be withdrawn and any claim(s) depending from or otherwise including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) will be entitled to examination in the instant application.

Although the examiner has indicated that a single disclosed species is required to be elected in addition to one of Inventions I-VI, it is not understood how the election of species applies to elected Invention III. All the patentably distinct species listed by the examiner on page 5 of the Office Action under (a) and (b) are not relevant to Invention III. Accordingly, the election of species requirement is respectfully

Appln. No. 10/721,742
Amd. dated April 13, 2006
Reply to Office Action of March 16, 2006

traversed as not being relevant to the elected invention or group.


Reconsideration and withdrawal of the election of species requirement are therefore respectfully requested.

Favorable consideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By



Allen C. Yun

Registration No. 37,971

ACY:pp
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\N\nozaki8.1A\pto\amendmentOA3-16-06.doc